



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/840,421	04/23/2001	Amir Hekmatpour	RAL20000098US1	4181

45503 7590 05/26/2005

DILLON & YUDELL LLP
8911 N. CAPITAL OF TEXAS HWY.,
SUITE 2110
AUSTIN, TX 78759

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, CINDY

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2161

DATE MAILED: 05/26/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/840,421

Applicant(s)

HEKMATPOUR, AMIR

Examiner

Cindy Nguyen

Art Unit

2171

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 March 2005.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 and 23-36 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) 20,21 and 23-36 is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 9-19 is/are rejected.
7) ☒ Claim(s) 4-8 is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 April 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This is in response to amendment filed 03/16/05.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claims 1 and 4 contain subject matter "virtual database management system for mapping both homogeneous and various heterogenous information structures utilized by said sources to a common syntax which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 4 and 28 are recites the limitation "wherein said product" in product.

There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

1. Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-3, 9-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thackston (US 6295513) in view of Dole (US 6634008).

Regarding claims 1 and 28, Thackston discloses: A computer-based design framework for and a computer program product for use by dispersed designed teams that required access to and interaction with each other, said framework comprising:

a virtual database management system (204, fig. 2, Thackston), which receives data from a plurality of distinct source that are involved in the collaborative design of a product and creates a single database interface to said sources for accessing a single unified design database (col. 20, lines 20-40, Thackston);

additional logic associated with said virtual database management system that provides a set of publishing rules for extracting information on demand and publishing said extracted information in a format recognized by a requestor of said information (col. 21, lines 40-60, Thackston).

However, Thackson didn't disclose: software code associated with said virtual database management system for mapping various informational structures utilized by said sources to a common syntax. On the other hand, Dole discloses: software code associated with said virtual database management system for mapping both homogenous and various heterogenous informational structures utilized by said sources to a common syntax, wherein dispersed design data and design rules are collected, compiled and maintained in the central repository for each stage of design(col. 16, lines 49-55, Dole). Thus, at the time invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include software code associated with said virtual database management system for mapping various informational structures utilized by said sources to a common syntax in the system of Thackson as taught by Dole. The motivation being to provide the method using XML, the designer captures a design methodology in a single file in the form of XML script.

In addition, Thackson/Dole discloses: a computer readable medium (col. 21, lines 3, Thackson); and program code on said computer readable medium for enabling collaborative design of a product (col. 11, lines 25-45, Thackson).

Regarding claim 2, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 1 above. In addition, Thackson/Dole discloses: wherein: each of said distinct sources represents a design team with one or more design team members provided access to said virtual database management system via a network (260, fig. 2 and col. 14, lines 21-50, Thackson); and said common syntax is an eXtensible Markup Language (XML) (col. 16, lines 20-30, Dole).

Regarding claim 3, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 1 above. In addition, Thackson/Dole discloses: further comprising program code for providing platform-independent application and services exchange utilizing XML wrapped data, service, and application that is delivered to a client (col. 10, lines 5-35, Thackson).

Regarding claim 9, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 3 above. In addition, Thackson/Dole discloses: wherein said program code for providing platform independent application and services exchange includes a universal description discovery and integration director for locating services and exchange data and service according to simple object access protocol (col. 17, lines 51 to col. 18, lines 57, Thackson).

Regarding claim 10, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 9 above. In addition, Thackson/Dole discloses: wherein said network is a local area network and connection to said framework by each of said design team members is provided via a LAN connected terminal (col. 9, lines 25-42, Thackson).

Regarding claim 11, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 9 above. In addition, Thackson/Dole discloses: wherein said network is the internet; said virtual database management system is hosted on a server on the Internet (260, fig. 2, Thackson); and wherein access to said design framework is provided via a web browser of a computer system that is connected to the Internet and

is utilized by said design team members (col. 17, lines 51 to col. 18, lines 57, Thackson).

Regarding claim 12, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 11 above. In addition, Thackson/Dole discloses: further comprising an Access-Privilege-manager implemented with program code that monitors and controls access to said design framework by design teams, design team members, and other selected personnel groups, and design automation tools (col. 14, lines 42 to col. 15, lines 3, Thackson).

Regarding claim 13, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 12 above. In addition, Thackson/Dole discloses: wherein said access privilege manager maintains a control list of one or more authorization parameters from among users, user identification and passwords, a level of authorization for each user and group a group to which each user belongs, specific group authority for access, and access authorization for one or more project administrator, (col.. 18, lines 40 to col. 19, lines 10, Thackson).

Regarding claim 14, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 13 above. In addition, Thackson/Dole discloses: wherein access to processes and designs within said framework is only granted to a user whose authorization and registered role supports said access (col. 19, lines 10-40, Thackson).

Claims 15-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thackson (US 6295513) in view of Dole (US 6634008 and further in view of Dragulev et al. (US 20010037407).

Regarding claim 15, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 14 above. However, Thackson/Dole didn't disclose: wherein said access-privilege-manager supports biometric security features for user access to said framework. On the other hand, Dragulev discloses: wherein said access-privilege-manager supports biometric security features for user access to said framework (page 2, 0029, Dragulev). Thus, at the time invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include biometric security features for user access to said framework in the combination system of Thackson/Dole as taught by Dragulev. The motivation being to protect network servers and users from hacker attacks.

Regarding claim 16, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 15 above. In addition, Thackson/Dole discloses: further comprising a customer help at terminal (CHATSOC) function that provides an online collaboration and conferencing between design teams, design team members, and other personnel (col. 9, lines 5-13, Thackson).

Regarding claim 17, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 16 above. In addition, Thackson/Dole discloses: wherein CHATSOC further provides outside assistance to a design team and design team member, wherein said outside assistance is selected from a compiled database of outside assistance personnel in response to a request for assistance by said design team or

design team member, wherein a peer to peer connection is dynamically established when an outside assistance personnel accepts and acknowledges the request (col. 9, lines 4-13, Thackson).

Regarding claim 18, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 17 above. In addition, Thackson/Dole discloses: wherein each design team may be provides local ownership of a particular task within the design teams, wherein said local ownership allows for a determination of a level of corporation with other design teams and a level of information sharing desired (col. 24, lines 16-34, Dole).

Regarding claim 19, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 18 above. In addition, Thackson/Dole discloses: wherein said design is divided into a plurality of tasks (col. 24, line 31, Dole), and said framework further includes program code for tracking each of said plurality of tasks and tools available within a design environment (col. 24, lines 26-30, Dole); matching tasks to specific tools, wherein processing intensive tasks are assigned to fastest processors and application available in said design environment (col. 6, lines 49-58, Thackson); matching task to a team and team members with a required expertise (col. 6, lines 59-65, Thackson).

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 4 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action.

Claims 5-8 are depended on claim 4 above. It is therefore objected.

Claims 20, 21, 23-27-36 are allowed.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the prior art of record failed to suggest: a method for distributed, collaborative design of a product in a computer-network base design environment, said method comprising: wherein said product is a system-on-a chip further comprising enable said collaborative features of said design framework utilizing a system on a chip extensible markup language (SOCML) that allows cross interaction between different design terms utilizing different tools, said SOCML providing a specific XML schema to define system-on-a chip design data and a standard for storing and transporting SOC specification and design data as recited in claims 20 and 28.

Claims 21, 23-27 and 29-36 are depended on claims 20 and 28 above. It is therefore allowable.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not


mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cindy Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305-4698. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 8:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 703-308-1436. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9306 for regular communications and 703-872-9306 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.


Cindy Nguyen
May 20, 2005


FRANTZ COBY
PRIMARY EXAMINER